

3. CLAIM Rejections Under - 35 USC paragraph 103.

Claims 1-4 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Barber (patent #1,346,805), in view of Meuret (patent #4,599,976) and further in view of Bauer (patent # 3,565,049).

All the Claims and Specifications have been rewritten to define patentability over these references, and any combination thereof. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections since now only two-stroke, four chamber and two-stroke two chamber operation of the engine remains active. Furthermore any combination of similar features of the above mentioned prior art may produce a new and unexpected useful results as it becomes obvious in the present invention. It could be recognized now that in the remaining embodiment of the present invention there is no need for internal or eternal valving means and an appropriate camshaft. All of the prior art patents use some kind of very complicated external or internal valving mechanisms and camshafts. The present invention is a valveless engine which, together with other mentioned advantages, makes it much lighter, simpler and more efficient.


CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, applicant submits that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that all the claims define patentability over the prior art. Therefore the applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, which action the applicant respectfully solicits.

Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance

Applicant has amended the specification and the claims of this application so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests again the constructive assistance and suggestions of the examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. prgrphs. 2173.02 and 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings. If the examiner agrees but does not feel that the present claims are technically adequate, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner write acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j).

Very Respectfully:


Kamen George Kamenov

PH: 415 - 387 7143 H.
415 - 987 7143 cell.